

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The Office Action dated November 15, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 4 and 8 have been cancelled without prejudice as being drawn to a non-elected species. Claims 1-3, 6, 7 and 9-19 are pending the application. Applicant kindly requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 19 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant elects not to rewrite claim 19 to independent form at this time to permit the Examiner to reconsider the objection in view of the comments presented in this Response. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Office Action, 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0178467, issued to Lee et al. (hereafter "Lee '467") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0101547, issued to Lee et al. (hereafter "Lee '547"). Applicant traverses the rejection because Lee '467 is not valid prior art against the claims of the present application. The present application serial number 10/670,380 claims foreign priority to Korean Patent Application No. 2002-58557, filed September 26, 2002. The filing date of Korean Patent Application No. 2002-58557 antedates the September 30, 2002 filing date of Lee '467. To perfect Applicant's claim for priority, a certified English translation of Korean Application No. 2002-58557 is filed herewith. As such Lee '467 is not valid prior art against the claims of the present application.

Applicant further traverses the rejection because Lee '547, alone, fails to teach all of the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lee '547 fails to teach or suggest a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display panel that includes "forming a liquid crystal display panel by providing a liquid crystal layer between the color filter and thin film transistor substrates; subsequently discharging at least one surface of the liquid crystal display panel using an ionizer system", as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, Lee '547 fails to teach a method for discharging an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes, "providing a liquid crystal layer between the color filter and thin film transistor substrates to form a liquid crystal display panel; subsequently discharging the thin film transistor substrate of the liquid crystal display panel" as recited in independent claim 6 of the present application.

Further, Lee '547 fails to teach a method for fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes "forming a liquid crystal display panel by attaching the first substrate to the second substrate; and subsequently providing a discharging device for removing an electrostatic charge from the liquid crystal display panel", as recited in independent claim 9 of the present application.

Because Lee '547 fails to teach at least the above features of claims 1, 6 and 9, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3, claim 6 and its dependent claim 7, and claim 9 and its dependent claims 10 and 12-18 are allowable over Lee '467 and Lee '547. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee '467 and Lee '547, and further in view of the M. Ohta et al. article cited by Applicant (hereafter "M. Ohta article") and U.S. Patent No. 6,853,435, issued to Tanaka et al. (hereafter "Tanaka"). As stated above, Lee '467 is not valid prior art against the claims of the present application. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Lee '547, Tanaka nor the M. Ohta article, analyzed alone or in any combination teaches the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Lee '547, Tanaka and the M. Ohta article fail to teach a method for fabricating an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device that includes "forming a liquid crystal display panel by attaching the first substrate to the second substrate; and subsequently providing a discharging device for removing an electrostatic charge from the liquid crystal display panel" as recited in independent claim 9, from which claims 10 and 11 depend.

Because Lee '547, Tanaka and the M. Ohta article fail to teach the above features of claim 9, claim 9 and its dependent claims 10 and 11 are allowable over Lee '547, Tanaka and the M. Ohta article. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Response dated February 14, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated November 15, 2005

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant